

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The claims are 1 and 4-19, with claims 15-18 being withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 9, 14 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, for reasons set forth below, it is considered that all of the claims in the application are now in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 1, as above amended, it has been combined with claims 2 and 3. The significance of this amendment will become further apparent from the remarks below.

As is clearly seen from above amended claim 1, the plastics-covered metal plate of the present invention has the following features (a), (b) and (c):

- (a) one surface or both surfaces of the metal plate are covered by a laminate of at least two kinds of plastic films whose elongation rates are different from one another;
- (b) the laminate comprising a plastic film (A) with smaller elongation rate at the upper side farther from the metal plate and a plastic film (B) with larger elongation rate at the lower side nearer to the metal plate; and
- (c) the elongation rate of the plastic film (B) is larger than the elongation rate of the plastic film (A) by at least 10%.

The present invention has achieved a marked improvement in resistance to chipping caused by spattering gravel by means of laminating a metal plate for a car body with two kinds of plastic films having different elongation rates, in such a manner as to satisfy the above-mentioned specific requirements (b) and (c).

The external force of spattering gravel is irregular. However, the combination of the above-mentioned two kinds of specific plastic films (A) and (B) allows the plastics-covered metal plate of the present invention to sufficiently withstand the varying external force of spattering gravel.

Furthermore, the laminated plastic film of the present invention is well fitted to the shape of a car body, which consists of curved surfaces, and thus improves chipping resistance, corrosion resistance and distinctness of image gloss.

Claims 1-8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over March et al. (U.S. 5,937,521).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

March et al. deals with a technical field very different from the present invention and is therefore considered not to be pertinent prior art. As discussed above, the present invention is a plastics-covered metal plate used for a car body, in which one surface or both surfaces of the metal plate are covered by a laminate of at least two kinds of plastic films whose elongation rates are different from each other.

March et al., on the other hand, relates to a method of making elongated plastic members such as reinforced plastic marine pilings, telephone poles, and the like.

As shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 of March et al., the elongated plastic members of March et al. basically have a structure wherein the periphery of a plastic core 12, which has a central longitudinal axis 14, is coated with a plastic shell 18, in which a rigid reinforcing bar 20 is embedded.

The elongated plastic members of March et al., do not have a structure wherein the surface of a metal plate is covered with a laminate of two different types of plastic films. Moreover, March et al. does not teach or suggest the concept of using two different types of plastic films such as those which satisfy requirements (a) and (b) above.

Hence, March et al. is essentially different from and unsuggestive of the plastics-covered metal plate for a car body of the present invention.

The invention of March et al. has nothing to do with the technique of covering a metal plate with a plastic film.

March neither teaches nor suggests the concept of covering a metal plate with a plastic film and it goes without saying that March discloses or suggests nothing about covering a metal plate with a laminate of at least two kinds of plastic films whose elongation rates are different from each other.

The rejection states, "The reference discloses steel (metal) is coated with the well-known coatings (column 5, lines 44-45)..." March et al., in column 5, lines 44-45, however, only teaches that "steel rebar" is usable as the rigid reinforcing bar. In March, the steel bar is to be embedded

as a reinforcing bar in a plastic shell. March does not teach or suggest the concept of covering a steel bar with at least two kinds of plastic layers with different elongation rates.

The rejection further states, "March discloses elongated plastic members (column 2, line 48) wherein a metal (20) is covered by a plastic shell (18) and a plastic core (12) comprised of suitable thermoplastic resins such as polyolefins, including polyester (column 4, lines 59-67)." As is clearly seen in Fig. 1 of March et al., however, a rigid reinforcing bar (20) is completely embedded in the resin matrix of the plastic shell, and thus, the bar (20) is not covered with a laminate of shell (18) and core (12). Furthermore, said bar (20) has a round, stick-like shape which is quite different from the metal plate of the present invention.

The plastics-covered metal plate of the present invention is thus essentially different and unobvious from the extruded plastic members of March et al.

It would thus be evident that the present invention is unobvious and patentable over March et al.


Further, rejoinder of non-elected claims 15-18 is respectfully requested in view of the fact that they are directed to a method of using the metal plate of allowable claim 1. See MPEP §821.04.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Tadashi WATANABE et al.

By: 
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/da
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 3, 2004